REMARKS

This is in response to the non-final Official Action currently outstanding with regard to the above-identified case.

Claims 58-62 were pending in the above-identified application at the time of the issuance of the currently outstanding non-final Official Action. Claims 1-57 were canceled, without prejudice, previously during this prosecution. By the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have amended Claim 62. No Claims have been canceled, added or withdrawn. Further, no change in the inventorship of this application arises by virtue of the foregoing Amendment. Accordingly, upon the entry of the foregoing Amendment, Claims 58-62 as hereinabove amended will constitute the claims under active prosecution in the above-identified application.

The claims of this application as they will stand upon the entry of the foregoing Amendment are reproduced above including appropriate status identifiers and indications of the changes being made as required by the Rules.

More specifically, in the currently outstanding non-final Official Action, the Examiner has:

1. Not re-acknowledged Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 USC §119 (a)-(d) or (f), and has not reconfirmed the receipt by the United States Patent and Trademark Office of the required copies of the priority documents. **– Applicants respectfully note that this matter was attended to by the Examiner satisfactorily earlier in this prosecution.**

2. Not reconfirmed his acceptance of the formal drawings filed with this application on 10 April 2006. **– Applicants respectfully note that this matter was attended to by the Examiner satisfactorily earlier in this prosecution.**

3. Provided Applicants with a Notice of References Cited (Form PTO-892).

4. Electronically acknowledged Applicants' Information Disclosure Statements of August 16, 2011, May 5, 2011, June 21, 2011, August 4, 2011, and March 10, 2011 by providing Applicants with a marked copy of the Form PTO/SB/08 that respectively accompanied each Statement.

- **Applicants have noted in the latter regard that the Examiner has crossed out the foreign references for which no English language translation was provided specifically. *Applicants do not agree with this procedure.* Rather, it is Applicants' belief that in the absence of a specific English language translation of a foreign language reference, the reference is to be considered for whatever it may inherently teach. In addition, Applicants respectfully call attention to the fact that the Information Disclosure Statements involved herein each clearly described an English language equivalent for all foreign language documents provided without a specific English language translation. Applicants respectfully submit that such is sufficient. Accordingly, acknowledgment of the consideration of *all* references listed on Applicants' various Forms PTO/SB/08 in response to this submission is respectfully requested.**

5. Rejected Claims 58, 59 and 61 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner indicates that Claims 58 and 59 contain various equivalent of "means plus function" language, but appears to only particularly question the phraseology "synchronization control section for" that he suggests corresponds to "block 22" of Fig. 4 because the specific structure/acts that comprise "block 22" are not clearly and specifically defined in the specification. –

Applicants have reviewed the present specification and have noted that the specific structure, material or acts that comprise the claimed function of "block 22" appear to be stated in significant detail in the specification. In this regard, Applicants particularly call attention, for example, to the present specification at page 31, lines 10-11; Page 32, line 8, to Page 34, line 15; Page 35, lines 19-23; Page 48, line 19, to the end of Page 50; Page 65, line 12, to Page 66, line 3; Page 72, lines 14 to 24; and the paragraph bridging pages 117 and 118. Hence, Applicants respectfully

submit that the currently outstanding rejection under 35 USC 112 should be withdrawn.

6. Deemed Claim 61 to be confusing because its recites of apparatus and method limitations in the same claim. – **In response to this rejection, Applicants have rephrased Claim 61 and respectfully submit that as rephrased Claim 61 is not longer unclear.**

7. Requested confirmation that the subject matter of each of the claims was commonly owned at the time that it was made. **– Applicants hereby confirm that the subject matter of all of the claims of this application was commonly owned at the time that it was made.**

8. Rejected Claims 58, 59, 61 and 62 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jung et al (US Patent No. 7,945,141) in view of Thompson (US Published Patent Application No. 2003/0229899) and Martinolich et al (US Published Patent Application No. 2006/0136982).

9. Rejected Claim 60 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jung et al, in view of Thompson et al, in view of Martinolich et al, in view of Tanenbaum (1984 publication entitled "Structured Computer Organization").

10. Similarly rejected Claims 58-62 for the same reasons as stated in items 8 and 9 but relying primarily upon the Chung et al reference (US Published Patent Application No. 2003/0095794) instead of the Jung et al reference.

Further comment concerning items 1-7 above is not deemed to be required in these Remarks.

With respect to items 8-10, however, Applicants have the following comments for the consideration of the Examiner:

The event table of the Thompson reference includes the "event reference", not the "event ID". Furthermore, it seems from the descriptions in paragraphs 0028 and 0030, etc., of the Thompson reference that this "event reference" alone can serve as a reference to the event.

In contrast to this, the invention recited in Claim 58 above uses the "ID being a target with which a process is associated by use of the program". This ID is not capable of specifying any process. Consequently, the invention recited in Claim 58 above is configured so as to use the program for associating a process with the ID. This is to say that the event table of the Thompson reference does not include any information that corresponds to the "ID being a target with which a process is associated by the use of a program", which is included in the synchronization timing information of the subject application.

The same is respectfully submitted to be the case with respect to the Martinolich reference. In particular, the Martinolich reference describes recording, as a separate file, the trigger data to be used for triggering a synchronization process. However, this trigger data does not include any information that corresponds to the "ID being a target with which a process is associated by the use of a program" (see paragraphs 0026 – 0030, etc., of the Martinolich reference).

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that it will be seen that according to the invention recited in Claim 58 of the subject application set forth hereinabove, "the ID being a target with which a process is associated by use of the program" is included in the synchronization timing information. This in turn brings about the effect that "the program does not need to be rewritten even in cases where the video data is edited after creating the program", and the effect of "being able to change a program without correcting synchronization timing information so as to change a process to be carried out". This is to say that the invention recited in Claim 58 above brings about the advantageous effects that cannot be achieved by the combination of (i) the Jung et al or the Chung et al reference, with (ii) the Thompson and Martinolich references.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing Amendments and Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the Examiner's currently outstanding objections and rejections now have been overcome. Hence, entry of the foregoing Amendments, reconsideration, and allowance of the above-presented claims in response to this submission are respectfully requested.

Finally, Applicants believe that additional fees beyond those submitted herewith are not required in connection with the consideration of this response to the currently outstanding Official Action. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. **04-1105**, as necessary, for the correct payment of all fees which may be due in connection with the filing and consideration of this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 6, 2011

/David A. Tucker/
*ELECTRONIC **SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER***

Reg. No.: 27,840

David A. Tucker
(type or print name of practitioner)
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Tel. No. (617) 517-5508

Edwards Wildman Palmer LLP
P.O. Box 55874
P.O. Address

Customer No.: 21874

Boston, MA 02205